

REMARKS

Entry of the amendments to the claims and to the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 11, 12, and 17 have been amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 11–21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yao-Joe Yang or Jee in further view of Leonetti and Deblander is respectfully requested. Regarding claims 11–16, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 11 has been amended to recite “a rigid cover over *and enclosing* said array of squeeze film dampers.” Yao-Joe Yang, Jee, Leonetti, and Deblander fail to show or suggest at least a rigid cover over *and enclosing* an array of squeeze film dampers. Deblander shows only facings which do not cover or enclose the sandwich element disclosed therein. Therefore, even if the combination of Yao-Joe Yang, Jee, Leonetti, and Deblander was made, the combination would not disclose all of the elements of independent claim 11. Further, Deblander teaches away from the combination of elements in independent claim 11 because the facings shown in Figs. 6 and 7 of Deblander are used for structural reinforcement of the sandwich element while the rigid cover of independent claim 11 is used to dampen or absorb noise that is transmitted around the squeeze film dampers. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have no reason to combine Yao-Joe Yang, Jee, Leonetti, and Deblander because such a combination is not directed to solving the problem of noise transmitted around the squeeze film dampers. For at least these reasons, independent claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Claims 12–16 which depend from independent claim 11 are therefore also allowable.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Applicant respectfully points out that claim 12 has been amended to recite “a rigid *foam cover enclosing* said array of squeeze film dampers.” Yao-Joe

Yang, Jee, Leonetti, and Deblander fail to show or suggest at least a rigid *foam cover enclosing* an array of squeeze film dampers. Applicant respectfully reiterates the remarks set forth above regarding independent claim 11. In addition, Deblander teaches away from the use of a foam cover altogether because Deblander teaches that the facings in Figs. 6 and 7 should be made of plywood or metal for structural reinforcement of the sandwich element disclosed therein. Accordingly, dependent claim 12 is in condition for allowance.


Regarding claims 17-21, independent claim 17 has been amended to recite “a rigid cover over *and enclosing* said array of squeeze film dampers.” As discussed above, Yao-Joe Yang, Jee, Leonetti, and Deblander fail to show or suggest at least a rigid cover over *and enclosing* an array of squeeze film dampers. Applicant respectfully reiterates the remarks set forth above regarding independent claim 11. Accordingly, independent claim 17 is in condition for allowance. Claims 18-21 which depend from claim 17 are therefore allowable, as well.

Conclusion

In view of the aforesaid, reconsideration and allowance of all claims at issue are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP
225 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606
Phone: (312) 201-2000
Fax: (312) 201-2555

By: 

Gary R. Gillen
Reg. No. 35,157
Louis DiSanto
Reg. No. 51,331